

REMARKS

Forty-six claims are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-46 currently stand rejected. Claims 1, 14-15, 17, 21, 34-35, 37, 41, 43, 44, and 46 are amended herein. Reconsideration of the Application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examiner's Response To Amendment

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Applicant's arguments filed August 18, 2006 . . . have been fully considered by they are not persuasive." In particular, on page 5, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 37-56, of Sarabadhikari against "performing on-line management procedures while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists," as claimed by Applicants.

Applicants respectfully submit that column 4, lines 37-56, of Sarabadhikari is limited to discussing only the use of a "*removable image storage device*" that is "capable of two-way communication with the camera" (column 4, lines 47-49). Applicants therefore submit that the discussion of FIG. 1 from Sarabadhikari fails to disclose any "on-line" procedures, as claimed by Applicants. Applicants further submit that FIG. 1 of Sarabadhikari also fails to disclose any type of "active bi-directional electronic communication path," as claimed by Applicants.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites column 7, lines 15-50, of Sarabadhikari against "on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view, manipulate, select, and

download said ancillary data files,” as claimed by Applicants. Applicants respectfully submit that column 7, lines 15-50, of Sarabadhikari is limited to teachings for interacting with information on a removable “memory card 24” only after the card has been connected to the camera device (see column 7, lines 31-50). Applicants therefore submit that column 7, lines 15-50, of Sarabadhikari fails to disclose any “on-line” procedures or an “active bi-directional electronic communication path,” as claimed by Applicants.

In the prior Response to Office Action, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 21, and 41 to emphasize the foregoing points. In particular, claims 1, 21, and 41 have been amended to recite that *“a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, and to download said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device, said on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists from said imaging device to said computer in said distributed computer network”*(emphasis added). For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 21, and 41 are not unpatentable in view of the cited references.

Claim Objections

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 14-15, 34-35, 37, and 44 for various “informalities.” In response, Applicants herein amend claims 14-15, 17, 34-35, 37, and 44 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions, to thereby remedy the foregoing informalities. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to expressly withdraw the current objections to claims 14-15, 34-35, 37, and 44.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-41 and 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as “failing to comply with the written description requirement.” With respect to the rejections of claims 1, 21, and 41, the Examiner states that “nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to fully support transferring one or more ancillary data files in “a primary ancillary data flow” from said data source to said imaging device” In response, Applicants herein amend claims 1, 21, and 41 to remove the limitation “primary” from each of the corresponding independent claims, and submit that claims 1, 21, and 41 comply with the written description requirement. Dependent claims 2-20 and 22-40 depend from respective claims 1 and 21 similarly comply with the enablement requirement.

With regard to the rejection of claim 43, the Examiner states that “nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to fully support deleting a duplicate file type” On page 16, lines 19-23, of the Specification, Applicants

expressly state that “a data manager 524 from ancillary data module 416 may preferably reorganize or delete local ancillary data files 418 in camera device 110, depending upon the particular type of downloaded ancillary data files 418” (emphasis added). Applicants herein amend dependent claim 43 to remove the limitation “duplicate.”

With regard to the rejection of claim 44, the Examiner states that “nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to fully support template files that are utilized as setting or frameworks” Applicants respectfully traverse. On page 13, lines 21-25, of the Specification, Applicants expressly state that “ancillary data files 418 may include one or more template files (such as still templates, animated templates, voice-annotated templates) that may be utilized as a setting or a framework for presenting one or more images captured by camera device 110” (emphasis added). In addition, with further regard to claim 44, the Examiner states that nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to fully support “image transition template files” In response, Applicants herein amend claim 44 so that the foregoing limitation reads “image transition files.” This amendment of claim 44 is fully supported by the Specification, page 10, line 31.

With regard to the rejection of claim 45, the Examiner states that “nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to fully support a descriptor tag that includes all four limitations” Applicants respectfully traverse. On page 14, lines 14-19, of the Specification, Applicants expressly state that “descriptors 712 may include any appropriate information related to a corresponding set of

data 714. For example, a descriptor 712 may include information regarding the nature of the associated data 714, such at a data format or a data type.

Descriptor 712 may also include information regarding how the associated data 714 is organized, such at a data structure or a data size.” Applicants submit that “any appropriate information” would reasonable convey to one skilled in the art that any or all of the specifically disclosed examples cited above may be utilized as part of a “descriptor.”

With regard to the rejection of claim 46, the Examiner states that “nowhere within the disclosure was subject matter found to provide full support for an assignment of an ancillary data file to more than one of the several file categories.” Applicants respectfully traverse. On page 16, lines 13-16, of the Specification, Applicants expressly state that “ancillary data module 416 may assign each downloaded ancillary data file 418 to an appropriate file category, such as a template category, an overlay category, a background category, an Internet web page category, or an instructions category.

Applicants herein amend claim 46 to recites assigning an ancillary data file “to one of several file categories.” Claim 46 therefore does not recite assigning the ancillary data file to “more than one of the several file categories,” as stated by the Examiner. Claim 46 then recites five possible different file categories into which ancillary data may be assigned. Applicants submit that the cited passage from their Specification would enable one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been addressed by the foregoing remarks and amendments. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-41 and 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,006,039 to Steinberg et al. (hereafter 039). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

“For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. §102, every element of the claimed invention must be *identically* shown in a single reference.” *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1317 (CAFC 1988). The Applicants submit that 039 fails to identically teach every element of the claims, and therefore does not anticipate the present invention.

With regard to claim 42, “means-plus-function” language is utilized to recite elements and functionality similar to those recited in claims 1 and 21, as discussed below. Applicants therefore incorporate those remarks by reference with regard to claim 42. In addition, the Courts have frequently held that “means-plus-function” language, such as that of claim 42, should be construed in light of the Specification. More specifically, means-plus-function claim elements should be *construed to cover the corresponding structure, material or acts*

described in the specification, and equivalents thereof. Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the substantial differences between the teachings of 039 and Applicants' invention as disclosed in the Specification, claim 42 is therefore not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of the cited references.

As previously stated, Applicants specifically direct the Examiner's attention to Applicants' discussion of FIG. 8 (Specification, page 14, line 26 through page 16, line 31) which describes in detail the Applicants' claimed invention. Based upon the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that specific claim limitations of claim 42 have been identified in the Specification and in the arguments made with respect to claims 1 and 21. Because a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that every claimed limitation be *identically* taught by a cited reference, and because the Examiner fails to cite 039 to identically teach or suggest the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 42 so that this claim may issue in a timely manner.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-11, 13-17, 21, 24-31, and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,477,264 to Sarbadhikari et al. (hereafter Sarbadhikari) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,325 to Steinberg et al. (hereafter Steinberg). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which requires that three basic criteria must be met, as set forth in M.P.E.P. §2142:

"First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations."

The initial burden is therefore on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that modification of the device of Sarbadhikari according to the teachings of Steinberg would produce the claimed invention. Applicants submit that Sarbadhikari in combination with Steinberg fail to teach a number of the claimed elements of the present invention. Furthermore, Applicants also submit that neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg contain teachings for combining the cited references to produce the Applicants' claimed invention. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C §103 are improper.

Independent claims 1 and 21 recite that "a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files

that are stored on said data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, and to download said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device, said on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists from said imaging device to said computer in said distributed computer network”(emphasis added).” Applicants submit that the foregoing limitations are not taught or suggested either by the cited references, or by the Examiner’s citations thereto.

Sarbadhikari teaches “an electronic camera for capturing and storing images in a removable storage device which is also preloaded with software for operating the imaging system (see column 2, lines 54-56). In contrast, Applicants affirmatively claim a data source that is “implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network.”

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 40-49 of Sarbadhikari as support for rejecting Applicants’ claimed “on-line management procedures.” Applicants respectfully traverse. The “upstream modification of image data” discussed in Sarbadhikari occurs “during the capture and manipulation stages prior to storage” (see column 4, line 44), and is not part of any type of on-line management procedures.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Sarbadhikari nowhere discloses performing one or more on-line management procedures “*while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists*,” as claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Sarbadhikari fails to teach on-

line management procedures “*during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source,*” as claimed by Applicants.

In the Office Action, the Examiner concedes, with regard to the teachings of Sarabadhikari, that “a data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network is not taught.” Applicants concur. The Examiner then points to Steinberg to purportedly remedy these deficiencies in Sarabadhikari. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s interpretation of the teachings of Steinberg.

Steinberg teaches an external “communication device” that an electronic camera utilizes to send image data over an electronic network to a “remote computerized destination” (see column 1, line 44, through column 3, line 17). Steinberg explicitly refers to the network computer as a “destination” (see FIG. 1).

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintains that Steinberg teaches receiving data from a remote destination. Applicants respectfully submit that Steinberg fails to provide any enabling discussion with regard to receiving data from a remote destination. For example, Steinberg nowhere provides any specific examples of what type of data might be received from the remote destination. In particular, Steinberg nowhere discloses downloading anything resembling Applicants’ claimed “*ancillary data files*.”

The primary data flow described in Steinberg (camera to network) is in the opposite direction to the primary data flow recited by Applicants (network to camera). Applicants therefore submit that Steinberg *teaches away* from their claimed invention. A prior art reference which teaches away from the presently claimed invention is “strong evidence of nonobviousness.” In re Hedges, 783 F.2d 1038, 228 U.S.P.Q. 2d 685 (Fed.Cir. 1987). For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 21 are not unpatentable in light of the cited references.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of dependent claims 4-11, 13-17, 24-31, and 33-37, for at least the reasons that these claims are directly or indirectly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 4-11, 13-17, 24-31, and 33-37, so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-11, 13-17, 21, 24-31, and 33-37 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Sarbadhikari in view of Steinberg, and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are thus improper. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 4-11, 13-17, 21, 24-31, and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

On page 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari in view of Steinberg and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709 to Creamer et al. (hereafter Creamer). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As discussed above, for a valid *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." The initial burden is on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 2 and 22, for at least the reasons that these claims are directly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 2 and 22, so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

In addition, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that "obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive

supporting the combination.” In re Geiger, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants submit that there is no specific teaching of a combination that would result in Applicants’ invention, and therefore the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C §103 is not proper.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2 and 22 are not unpatentable over the cited references, and that the rejections are thus improper. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 22 so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

On page 21 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari in view of Steinberg and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,130 to Qian (hereafter Qian), and yet further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,190 to Aihara et al. (hereafter Aihara). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As discussed above, for a valid *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” The initial burden is on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 3 and 23, for at least the reasons that these claims are directly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 3 and 23, so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 3 and 23 are not unpatentable over the cited references, and that the rejections are thus improper. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3 and 23 so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

On page 23 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari in view of Steinberg and further in view of Aihara. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As discussed above, for a valid *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." The initial burden is on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie*

case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 12 and 32, for at least the reasons that these claims are directly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 12 and 32, so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

In addition, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach that the ancillary data files are created by both "*a system user on a local computer device and a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production equipment*" (emphasis added), as claimed by Applicants. For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 12 and 32 are not unpatentable over the cited references, and that the rejections are thus improper. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 12 and 32 so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

On page 24 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 18-20 and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari in view of Steinberg and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,957 to Anderson (hereafter Anderson). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As discussed above, for a valid *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." The initial burden is on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 18-20 and 38-40, for at least the reasons that these claims are directly or indirectly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 18-20 and 38-40, so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 18 and 38, the Examiner concedes that Sarbadhikari fails to teach an "off-line management procedure including a file descriptor identification procedure" Applicants concur. The Examiner then points to Anderson to purportedly remedy these deficiencies. Anderson is limited to teaching a camera device that accesses "executable files" from a "flash disk". Applicants therefore submit that Anderson fails to teach a "data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network," as claimed by Applicants.

Independent claim 41 has been amended to recite elements and functionality similar to those recited in claim 21, as discussed above. Applicants therefore incorporate those prior remarks by reference with regard to claim 41. For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 18-20 and 38-41 are not unpatentable over the cited references, and that the rejections are thus improper. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 18-20 and 38-41 so that these claims may issue in a timely manner.

Summary


Applicants submit that the foregoing amendments and remarks overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections. Because the cited references, or the Examiner's citations thereto, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, and in light of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited prior art, Applicants therefore submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request the Examiner to allow claims 1-46 so that the present Application may issue in a timely manner. If there are any questions concerning this amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

12/23/06

By: _____



Gregory J. Koerner, Reg. No. 38,519
Redwood Patent Law
1291 E. Hillsdale Blvd., Suite 205
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 358-4000